

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Masayuki Sakakura et al.
Serial No. : 10/827,444
Filed : April 20, 2004
Title : DISPLAY DEVICE

Art Unit : 2879
Examiner : Ashok Patel
Conf. No. : 2785

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO ACTION OF SEPTEMBER 22, 2006

Claims 1-13 are pending with claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 being independent. Claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 and the Examiner's indication that claims 7, 8, 12 and 13 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Claims 7, 8 and 11-13 have been rejected under section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The rejection indicates that the recitation in each of claims 7 and 11 that "the second video signal line overlaps the current supply line at least partly" renders the claims indefinite because there are two video signal lines (701a and 701b) each separately overlapping its respective current supply line (704 or 704b). Applicant respectfully disagrees that this recitation renders the claims indefinite. In particular, the claims clearly define the second video signal line, the current supply line, and the relationship between them. As such, for at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rather than being directed to the form of the claims, the rejection (as evidenced by the Examiner's statement that the second current supply line needs to be defined within the claim to provide necessary antecedent basis) appears to be based on the Examiner's view that the claims have not recited enough features of the implementation set forth in the specification. However, applicant is not required to recite every feature of the implementation in the independent claims, as long as the claims are supported by one or more described implementations, which is the case here. In particular, "the current supply line" of claims 7 and 11 finds support in element 704b of Fig. 4, where the "first video signal line" finds support in item 704a of Fig. 4. This is because

Applicant : Masayuki Sakakura et al.
Serial No. : 10/827,444
Filed : April 20, 2004
Page : 2 of 2

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-232001 / US7122

the relationship between "the first video signal line" and "the current supply line" has been limited by the electrical connection with "a switching transistor" (supported by the item 712 of Fig. 4).

All claims are in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with the filing of this paper on the Electronic Filing System (EPS). In the event that any fees are due, please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/22/06

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W. - 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
/adt
49387156.doc


John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640